## **EXHIBIT 1**

Case 2:10-cv-00106-LRH-VCF Document 315-1 Filed 05/31/12 Page 2 of 56 Page 1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA ----X IN THE MATTER OF: ORACLE, INC. et al Petitioner, Docket No.: -cv00106LRHPAL Vs. RIMINI STREET, INC. et al Respondent. ----X March 29, 2011 HELD AT: **BEFORE:** HONORABLE PEGGY A. LEEN, Judge APPEARANCES: GEOFFREY HOWARD, ESQ. Attorney for the Petitioner BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN Three Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111 415-393-2000 WEST ALLEN, ESQ. Attorney for the Respondent LEWIS AND ROCA 3993 Howard Hughes Pkwy, Suite 600 Las Vegas, NV 89169 702-949-8230

TRANSCRIBER: EMILY HOWARD

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

#### OCEEDINGS

Page 22 1 the scope of their proper license, they want to do 2 what they're allowed to do within the scope of that 3 proper license to ask somebody else to come and help them, what they would basically do themselves, if 4 5 they could, but they can't, don't have time, don't 6 know how to do it, so they ask a third-party to come 7 in and do basically what they would like to do. THE COURT: Hence the argument that what 8 9 your client is doing is perfectly lawful. 10 MR. ALLEN: That's true. But that goes 11 right to the issue of how you grapple with all the 12 discovery that the Plaintiff would like to do--13 THE COURT: [Interposing] And that's why I'm asking them is some bifurcation--does some 14 15 bifurcation make sense? Can you limit--can you agree 16 upon a statement of facts? They want to know the

bite into--MR. ALLEN: [Interposing] Well, I think Your Honor made an excellent starting suggestion, which is let's look at this issue of licensing, because the way I viewed the client's - - this case just less than a day or two ago, is that the first question everyone, uh, asked is are these consumers allowed to do, within the scope of their licenses, what they're

universe of what it is that you're doing before they

Page 24

call that cross-using software improperly, but--but really it's not. It's within the parameters of the license doing what that consumer is entitled to do. And--and maybe the way for this case to get resolved is to just define--uh, Oracle can define and we can all agree what's appropriate.

I think the concern in this case is that Oracle's reporting to its shareholders, they want to do what they did with SAP, which is eliminate that whole side industry and keep that for themselves. And of course they would want to do that. Um, all of us would if that's what we could do. But the real issue is what this proper--

THE COURT: [Interposing] If it belongs to them, they can and if it doesn't, they can't. I mean...

MR. ALLEN: That's right. And consumers, we believe, have a right to have a third party come in, within the proper scope of their license, fix and make updates and do repairs--

THE COURT: [Interposing] Right. So is the issue resolvable as a matter of law and a reasonable amount of discovery, Mr. Allen? That's what I asked the Plaintiff, I hope, in plain English, without going through the massive project that this is.

Page 23

#### asking Rimini to do?

17 18

19

20

21

22 23

<u>24</u> <u>25</u>

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

<u>15</u>

<u>16</u>

17 18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I just heard the issue of cross, uh--or using, uh, software for things they're not supposed to do. From what I've seen at Rimini, all they ever do is exactly what the consumer could do. And to the extent that Oracle's worried about cross-using of licenses, they are meticulous--and this is why it's not like the SAP case--they are meticulous at making sure--

THE COURT: [Interposing] They think your client has, uh, erased data that makes it difficult to trace exactly what you've done, that you've deleted data.

MR. ALLEN: From what I've seen so far, this client is very meticulous about making sure that they do exactly what that consumer has a license to do. And to the extent they might, uh, create economies of scale by taking what Consumer A can do and it's exactly what Consumer B can do, they may create economies of scale doing the exact same thing for Consumer B within the parameters and the scope of the license that Consumer B's allowed to do, which matches what Consumer A did. THE COURT: And what is--

MR. ALLEN: [Interposing] Now they want to

Page 25

Would you agree--can you agree with the Plaintiff on what a representative sample of the discovery is to present the issue to a judge to get a decision as a matter of law and what it is that you are doing?

First, can you agree on what you're doing? And two, can you, uh, agree, uh, on whether, uh, there's a--a small enough universe of licenses that are involved? And three, can you frame the issue for dispositive motion practice?

MR. ALLEN: I would say on behalf of Rimini, yes. In fact, that's one of the reasons we were here today, to make sure that that's what happens, as opposed to what I perceive has happened, is Oracle thought this might be just SAP Case II. They came in and realize that it was not, because this company is very meticulous in making sure that they do only what that licensee can do.

And so what's happened, in my view so far, is that Oracle now realizes we don't have the massive what they would deem as fraud or improper conduct. What we might have, if we can get enough samples, is individual episodes of maybe a little error here, a little error there and couple those all together and be able to show this horrible story.

But what the truth is is we're here because

#### OCEEDINGS

```
Page 46
 1
      of any depth. At least, it is for me.
 2
                So we'll see you back, see if we have, uh,
 3
      some, um, substantial progress and if we have a
      proposal for, uh, trimming this down into more
 4
 5
      manageable parts. And if not, that's what I get paid
 6
      the big bucks to decide, so...[laughter] Thank you for
 7
      appearing here, counsel. Good day.
                MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Your Honor.
 8
 9
                MR. MILLER: All rise.
10
                [END OF HEARING]
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
                                                  Page 47
                CERTIFICATE
 1
 2
 3
      I, Emily Howard certify that the foregoing transcript of
 4
 5
      proceedings in the United States District Court of Nevada:
 6
 7
      Oracle Inc. et al v Rimini Street, Inc. et al Docket No.
 8
        -cv00106LRHPAL was prepared using the required
 9
10
      transcription equipment and is a true and accurate record
11
      of the proceedings.
12
13
14
15
      Signature:
16
17
      Date: April 8, 2011
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

## **EXHIBIT 2**

```
Page 1
 1
           UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 2
          DISTRICT OF NEVADA (Las Vegas)
 3
        In the matter of:
 4
        ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation;
 5
        ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware Corporation;
 6
        and ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION,
 7
        a California corporation,
 8
                       Plaintiffs,
                                       Case No. 2:10-cv-0106-LRH-PAL
 9
10
        v.
11
12
        RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation; and
        SETH RAVIN, an individual,
13
14
                       Defendants.
15
16
                       Lloyd D. George U.S. Courthouse
17
18
                       333 Las Vegas Blvd. South
                       Las Vegas, NV
19
                       November 8, 2011
20
21
                       9:00 AM
22
23
        B E F O R E:
        HON. MAGISTRATE PEGGY A. LEEN
24
        DISTRICT COURT JUDGE
25
```

1	corporation that has superior knowledge	1	relevant. They were not disclosed as a
2	to Ms. Williams about this issue?	2	source of information. We found them by
3	MR. RECKERS: No. And so that's one	3	asking questions in depositions and then
4	of the reasons we put it in our brief.	4	
		5	by finding a remnant of a file in a
5	And the deposition transcript just went	6	personal virtual machine from one of our
6	final. So I think that with her		witnesses that was the menu for the
7	testimony she was deposed, obviously,	7	SharePoint system. And it was revelatory
8	on this important issue at some length.	8	because what it shows is links between
9	THE COURT: You're telling me that	9	the different materials that are on there
10	this is the best answer that your	10	that are the specific materials that are
<u>11</u>	corporation can provide because she is	11	central to the case. The software copies
<u>12</u>	the most knowledgeable person and she has	12	that they have, the way that they label
<u>13</u>	what level of detail the corporation has.	13	those, the way that they bring them up.
<u>14</u>	MR. RECKERS: Absolutely.	14	Exhibit R, to my to the Howard
<u>15</u>	THE COURT: And you're bound by	15	declaration, is one of the exhibits that
<u>16</u>	<u>that.</u>	16	we used in that deposition. It was Mr.
<u>17</u>	MR. RECKERS: Yes, Your Honor.	17	Conway's (ph.) deposition.
<u>18</u>	THE COURT: And you're not going to	18	So there is an important category of
<u>19</u>	claim that she's incorrect?	19	information that you can only have, and
20	MR. RECKERS: If we we're going	20	our experts can only have, by seeing the
21	to put the citations down and we're going	21	interrelationship that is revealed
<u>21</u> <u>22</u>	to review the citations and put the ones	22	through the dynamic system that is
<u>23</u>	down that the corporation was bound by.	23	SharePoint, how it's used, how they're
24	And as I stand here today, my general	24	brought out, how they're labeled, what
<u>25</u>	understanding is that she's correct and	25	they mean. That's how they use the
23	Page 18	23	Page 20
1	that is the corporation's answers to	1	software.
	these questions.	2	What we do have as a result,
	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you	2 3	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't
	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement	2 3 4	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data
	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's	2 3 4 5	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the
	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?	2 3 4	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data
	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's	2 3 4 5	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the
	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?	2 3 4 5 6	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the THE COURT: But you've reached an
	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be	2 3 4 5 6 7	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if
	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to interrogatories number 24 and 25 is	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was inadequate. And you have a procedure in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to interrogatories number 24 and 25 is granted to the extent that Rimini shall	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was inadequate. And you have a procedure in place and you've been operating under
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to interrogatories number 24 and 25 is granted to the extent that Rimini shall supplement answers to Interrogatory	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was inadequate. And you have a procedure in place and you've been operating under that procedure in place to request native
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to interrogatories number 24 and 25 is granted to the extent that Rimini shall supplement answers to Interrogatory number 24 and 25 with the information	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was inadequate. And you have a procedure in place and you've been operating under that procedure in place to request native information for files in which you agree
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to interrogatories number 24 and 25 is granted to the extent that Rimini shall supplement answers to Interrogatory number 24 and 25 with the information provided with Ms. Williams clarifying	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was inadequate. And you have a procedure in place and you've been operating under that procedure in place to request native information for files in which you agree the .tif version of it is inadequate for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to interrogatories number 24 and 25 is granted to the extent that Rimini shall supplement answers to Interrogatory number 24 and 25 with the information provided with Ms. Williams clarifying that it is the corporation's response and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was inadequate. And you have a procedure in place and you've been operating under that procedure in place to request native information for files in which you agree the .tif version of it is inadequate for purposes. So how are they violating any
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to interrogatories number 24 and 25 is granted to the extent that Rimini shall supplement answers to Interrogatory number 24 and 25 with the information provided with Ms. Williams clarifying that it is the corporation's response and within fourteen days of today's date and	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was inadequate. And you have a procedure in place and you've been operating under that procedure in place to request native information for files in which you agree the .tif version of it is inadequate for purposes. So how are they violating any rule when you reached an agreement about
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to interrogatories number 24 and 25 is granted to the extent that Rimini shall supplement answers to Interrogatory number 24 and 25 with the information provided with Ms. Williams clarifying that it is the corporation's response and within fourteen days of today's date and denied in all other respects.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was inadequate. And you have a procedure in place and you've been operating under that procedure in place to request native information for files in which you agree the .tif version of it is inadequate for purposes. So how are they violating any rule when you reached an agreement about we're going to do it this way at first
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to interrogatories number 24 and 25 is granted to the extent that Rimini shall supplement answers to Interrogatory number 24 and 25 with the information provided with Ms. Williams clarifying that it is the corporation's response and within fourteen days of today's date and denied in all other respects.  I'll hear from you on your motion to	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was inadequate. And you have a procedure in place and you've been operating under that procedure in place to request native information for files in which you agree the .tif version of it is inadequate for purposes. So how are they violating any rule when you reached an agreement about we're going to do it this way at first and then if you need something else, let
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to interrogatories number 24 and 25 is granted to the extent that Rimini shall supplement answers to Interrogatory number 24 and 25 with the information provided with Ms. Williams clarifying that it is the corporation's response and within fourteen days of today's date and denied in all other respects.  I'll hear from you on your motion to compel "Read-Only" access to Rimini's	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was inadequate. And you have a procedure in place and you've been operating under that procedure in place to request native information for files in which you agree the .tif version of it is inadequate for purposes. So how are they violating any rule when you reached an agreement about we're going to do it this way at first and then if you need something else, let us know and we'll talk about it and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to interrogatories number 24 and 25 is granted to the extent that Rimini shall supplement answers to Interrogatory number 24 and 25 with the information provided with Ms. Williams clarifying that it is the corporation's response and within fourteen days of today's date and denied in all other respects.  I'll hear from you on your motion to compel "Read-Only" access to Rimini's SharePoint internet.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was inadequate. And you have a procedure in place and you've been operating under that procedure in place to request native information for files in which you agree the .tif version of it is inadequate for purposes. So how are they violating any rule when you reached an agreement about we're going to do it this way at first and then if you need something else, let us know and we'll talk about it and provide it if we think that's reasonable.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to interrogatories number 24 and 25 is granted to the extent that Rimini shall supplement answers to Interrogatory number 24 and 25 with the information provided with Ms. Williams clarifying that it is the corporation's response and within fourteen days of today's date and denied in all other respects.  I'll hear from you on your motion to compel "Read-Only" access to Rimini's SharePoint internet.  MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Your Honor.	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was inadequate. And you have a procedure in place and you've been operating under that procedure in place to request native information for files in which you agree the .tif version of it is inadequate for purposes. So how are they violating any rule when you reached an agreement about we're going to do it this way at first and then if you need something else, let us know and we'll talk about it and provide it if we think that's reasonable.  MR. HOWARD: Yeah. And I think that
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to interrogatories number 24 and 25 is granted to the extent that Rimini shall supplement answers to Interrogatory number 24 and 25 with the information provided with Ms. Williams clarifying that it is the corporation's response and within fourteen days of today's date and denied in all other respects.  I'll hear from you on your motion to compel "Read-Only" access to Rimini's SharePoint internet.  MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Your Honor. Geoff Howard. With respect to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was inadequate. And you have a procedure in place and you've been operating under that procedure in place to request native information for files in which you agree the .tif version of it is inadequate for purposes. So how are they violating any rule when you reached an agreement about we're going to do it this way at first and then if you need something else, let us know and we'll talk about it and provide it if we think that's reasonable.  MR. HOWARD: Yeah. And I think that is all right and true as far as it goes
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to interrogatories number 24 and 25 is granted to the extent that Rimini shall supplement answers to Interrogatory number 24 and 25 with the information provided with Ms. Williams clarifying that it is the corporation's response and within fourteen days of today's date and denied in all other respects.  I'll hear from you on your motion to compel "Read-Only" access to Rimini's SharePoint internet.  MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Your Honor. Geoff Howard. With respect to the SharePoint materials, I don't think	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was inadequate. And you have a procedure in place and you've been operating under that procedure in place to request native information for files in which you agree the .tif version of it is inadequate for purposes. So how are they violating any rule when you reached an agreement about we're going to do it this way at first and then if you need something else, let us know and we'll talk about it and provide it if we think that's reasonable.  MR. HOWARD: Yeah. And I think that is all right and true as far as it goes and it applies and the parties have been
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	these questions.  THE COURT: And how soon are you going to be in a position to supplement your response with her testimony that's now the corporation's answer?  MR. RECKERS: It certainly can be served within the next ten days.  THE COURT: Thank you. Oracle's motion to compel omitted responses to interrogatories number 24 and 25 is granted to the extent that Rimini shall supplement answers to Interrogatory number 24 and 25 with the information provided with Ms. Williams clarifying that it is the corporation's response and within fourteen days of today's date and denied in all other respects.  I'll hear from you on your motion to compel "Read-Only" access to Rimini's SharePoint internet.  MR. HOWARD: Thank you, Your Honor. Geoff Howard. With respect to the	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	What we do have as a result, violates Rule 34 both because it doesn't reveal those characteristics of the data as they exist in the  THE COURT: But you've reached an agreement to the beginning of this case about what you were going to do and if what you got in response to the electronic request for data was inadequate. And you have a procedure in place and you've been operating under that procedure in place to request native information for files in which you agree the .tif version of it is inadequate for purposes. So how are they violating any rule when you reached an agreement about we're going to do it this way at first and then if you need something else, let us know and we'll talk about it and provide it if we think that's reasonable.  MR. HOWARD: Yeah. And I think that is all right and true as far as it goes

1		1
1	INDEX	
2	INDEX	2 CERTIFICATION
3		3
4	RULINGS	I, Lisa Bar-Leib, hereby certify that the
5		5 foregoing is a true and correct transcription, to
6	DESCRIPTION PAGE LINE	6 the best of my ability, of the sound recorded
7	Plaintiffs' request to compel 19 17	7 proceedings submitted for transcription.
8	amended responses to interrogatories	8
9	#24 and #25 GRANTED to the extent	9 I further certify that I am not employed by
10	defendant shall supplement answers to	10 nor related to any party to this action.
11	interrogatories with information	11
12	provided by Ms. Williams clarifying that	12 In witness whereof, I hereby sign this date:
13	it is corporation's response within	13 November 14, 2011.
14	14 days of this date's hearing and	14
15	DENIED in all other respects	15
16		16
17	Plaintiffs' request to compel 29 21	17
18	read-only access DENIED and	18
19	plaintiffs' counsel shall be	19 LISA BAR-LEIB
20	required to request on an	20 AAERT Certified Transcriber (CET**D-486)
21	individual basis type of information	21
22	and level of detail that they	22
23	•	23
	are seeking	24
24		25
25	Page 46	Page 48
	tage 40	Tage 40
1		
2	INDEV cont'd	
3	INDEX, cont'd	
1	DILLINGG	
4	RULINGS	
5	DECOMPOSION BACE INC	
6	DESCRIPTION PAGE LINE	
7	Court will GRANT plaintiff up to 2 34 4	
8	days to conduct deposition of Mr.	
9	Ravin subject to defense counsel's	
10	belief that plaintiff will conduct	
11	examination that is reasonable and	
12	not meant to harass witness in any	
13	way in which case defense may seek	
14	remedies under Rule 30(d)	
15		
16	Defendants' request for clarification 37 20	
17	concerning pretrial depositions is	
18	such that no additional depositions	
19	are permitted after conclusion of	
20	discovery, after dispositive motions	
21	have been ruled on and after joint	
22	pretrial order was filed without	
23	strong showing of good cause that	
24		
25	defendants could not have anticipated	
25	parties named as trial witnesses Page 47	
1	rage 4/	

## **EXHIBIT 3**

1 2 3 4 5 6	BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP RICHARD J. POCKER (NV Bar No. 3568) 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 800 Las Vegas, NV 89101 Telephone: (702) 382-7300 Facsimile: (702) 382-2755 rpocker@bsfllp.com  BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (pro hac vice) FRED NORTON (pro hac vice)	BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP GEOFFREY M. HOWARD (pro hac vice) THOMAS S. HIXSON (pro hac vice) KRISTEN A. PALUMBO (pro hac vice) Three Embarcadero Center San Francisco, CA 94111-4067 Telephone: 415.393.2000 Facsimile: 415.393.2286 geoff.howard@bingham.com thomas.hixson@bingham.com kristen.palumbo@bingham.com
7	KIERAN P. RINGGENBERG (pro hac vice 1999 Harrison Street, Suite 900 Oakland, CA 94612	DORIAN DALEY (pro hac vice) DEBORAH K. MILLER (pro hac vice)
8	Telephone: (510) 874-1000 Facsimile: (510) 874-1460	JAMES C. MAROULIS (pro hac vice) ORACLE CORPORATION
9	sholtzman@bsfllp.com fnorton@bsfllp.com	500 Oracle Parkway M/S 5op7
10	kringgenberg@bsfllp.com	Redwood City, CA 94070 Telephone: 650.506.4846
11	Attorneys for Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc., and Oracle International	Facsimile: 650.506.7114 dorian.daley@oracle.com
12	Corporation	deborah.miller@oracle.com jim.maroulis@oracle.com
13		EC DICTRICT COURT
14		ES DISTRICT COURT  CT OF NEVADA
15	DISTRI	OF NEVADA
16	ORACLEUSA INC. a Colorado corporati	on: CASE NO 2:10-cy-0106-LRH-PAL
16 17	ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware corporation: and ORACLE INTERNATION	
16 17 18		AL PLAINTIFFS ORACLE USA, INC., ORACLE AMERICA, INC., AND
16 17	ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATION	PLAINTIFFS ORACLE USA, INC., ORACLE AMERICA, INC., AND ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION'S FIFTH SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO DEFENDANT
16 17 18 19	ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATION CORPORATION, a California corporation,  Plaintiffs,  v.  RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation	PLAINTIFFS ORACLE USA, INC., ORACLE AMERICA, INC., AND ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION'S FIFTH SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO DEFENDANT RIMINI STREET, INC.
16 17 18 19 20	ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATION CORPORATION, a California corporation,  Plaintiffs,  v.  RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation SETH RAVIN, an individual;	PLAINTIFFS ORACLE USA, INC., ORACLE AMERICA, INC., AND ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION'S FIFTH SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO DEFENDANT RIMINI STREET, INC.
16 17 18 19 20 21	ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATION CORPORATION, a California corporation,  Plaintiffs,  v.  RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation	PLAINTIFFS ORACLE USA, INC., ORACLE AMERICA, INC., AND ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION'S FIFTH SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO DEFENDANT RIMINI STREET, INC.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22	ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATION CORPORATION, a California corporation,  Plaintiffs, v.  RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation SETH RAVIN, an individual;  Defendants.	PLAINTIFFS ORACLE USA, INC., ORACLE AMERICA, INC., AND ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION'S FIFTH SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO DEFENDANT RIMINI STREET, INC.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATION CORPORATION, a California corporation,  Plaintiffs, v.  RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation SETH RAVIN, an individual;,  Defendants.	PLAINTIFFS ORACLE USA, INC., ORACLE AMERICA, INC., AND ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION'S FIFTH SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO DEFENDANT RIMINI STREET, INC.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATION CORPORATION, a California corporation,  Plaintiffs, v.  RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation SETH RAVIN, an individual;  Defendants.  PROPOUNDING PARTY: Plainting	PLAINTIFFS ORACLE USA, INC., ORACLE AMERICA, INC., AND ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION'S FIFTH SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO DEFENDANT RIMINI STREET, INC.
16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25	ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATION CORPORATION, a California corporation,  Plaintiffs, v.  RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation SETH RAVIN, an individual;  Defendants.  PROPOUNDING PARTY: Plainting	PLAINTIFFS ORACLE USA, INC., ORACLE AMERICA, INC., AND ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION'S FIFTH SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO DEFENDANT RIMINI STREET, INC.  on;

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Procedure 26 and 33, Plaintiffs hereby request that Defendant Rimini Street, Inc. answer the following Interrogatories. **DEFINITIONS AND INSTRUCTIONS** For purposes of these Interrogatories: The term "Environment" means a copy of Oracle software that results from 1. installation of that software. The term "Identify" means to give, to the extent known, (1) the name of the item, 2. including product name and type, brand, type of media (e.g., CD), any name You assigned the item, and version number where applicable; (2) the location of the item (physical location or, if stored on an Identified Rimini Computer System, the network location); (3) the total quantity of items; (4) the date on which You acquired or produced the item, and (5) the customer from whom it was obtained and/or in whose name it was being held at the pertinent times. 3. The term "Identified Rimini Computer System(s)" refers to any computer, computer system, server, electronic storage environment, or network device in Rimini's possession, custody, or control, including but not limited to those systems identified or referenced in Rimini Street Inc.'s Responses or First Supplemental Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories, Nos. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 or 12. The term "Installation Media" refers to any CD, DVD, download, electronic file, 4. or similar item that can be or has been used to install software on Identified Rimini Computer System(s). 5. The term "Non-Customer Location" means any location on an Identified Rimini Computer System that is not referenced to a unique Rimini customer, is not specific to a unique Rimini customer, or is not exclusively used or designated for a unique Rimini customer. This includes but is not limited to the following Rimini network locations: \\rsiclsvr01\client software\PeopleSoft, \\rsi-clsvr01\internal software\, \\rsidata01\share\client archives\ ftp.peoplesoft.com\, \\rsi-data01\share\software\oracle, \\rsidata01\share\software\PeopleSoft, and \\10.12.1.5\fileshare\software\PeopleSoft.

1	6.	The term "Oracle" refers the plaintiffs named in the April 19, 2010 First	
2	Amended Cor	mplaint: Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc., and Oracle International	
3	Corporation a	ny of its predecessors, successors, parents, subsidiaries, and affiliates.	
4	7.	The term "Personnel" refers to past and current Rimini employees and any	
5	contractors or other third parties hired by Rimini.		
6	8.	The term "Response(s)" refers to Your interrogatory response(s), including any	
7	amended and	supplemental responses.	
8	9.	The terms "Rimini," "You," and "Your" refer to Rimini Street, Inc., all of its	
9	parents, subsi	diaries and affiliates, and all of their present and former officers, directors, agents,	
10	consultants, a	ttorneys, employees - including Seth Ravin - or other persons acting for or on	
11	behalf of any	of them.	
12	10.	The term "Software and Support Materials" means software applications and	
13	environments	, program updates, software updates, bug fixes, patches, custom solutions, and	
14	instructional a	and knowledge base documents for any families of software products provided by	
15	Oracle, includ	ling but not limited to those of the PeopleSoft, J.D. Edwards, Siebel, and Oracle	
16	database fami	lies of software products.	
17	11.	The term "Source" means the origin and name of all Installation Media, Software	
18	and Support N	Materials and/or existing Environment used to create an Environment (including all	
19	Sources for an	ny predecessor iterations or versions incorporated into an Environment, if	
20	applicable), a	nd further includes (1) the network or physical location(s) of the Source at the time	
21	it was used; (2	2) the customer from which or on whose behalf you claim to have obtained each	
22	Source (and, i	f you obtained a Source from Oracle, the website or media from which it was	
23	obtained); and	d (3) the identity (by name) of any other Environment used as a Source.	
24	12.	Unless otherwise stated, the time period covered by these Interrogatories is the	
25	time period be	eginning January 1, 2005. The topics are not limited to Rimini's current practices,	

13. These Interrogatories are to be considered continuing in nature, and You must

systems, and Personnel. The topics extend to practices, systems, and Personnel in place at any

**26** 

27

28

time since January 1, 2005.

- 1 promptly furnish supplemental responses if any additional responsive information is discovered
- 2 or created after Your responses are tendered, or if any of Your responses are subsequently
- 3 determined to be incorrect, incomplete, or misleading in any respect.

#### INTERROGATORIES

#### **INTERROGATORY NO. 20:**

For each Environment listed on Exhibit A or contained within a virtual machine listed on Exhibit A, Identify the Environment and the Source(s) from which You obtained all Installation Media used to create or modify that Environment. For example, if an Environment was created by cloning (copying) a previously existing Environment, which in turn was created from Installation Media stored on an Identified Rimini Computer System, which in turn were copied from physical Installation Media obtained directly from a specific client, the response should Identify the origins, names, locations at time of use, customer(s) from which or on whose behalf you claim to have obtained the materials (if applicable), and website(s) or media from which you obtained the materials (if applicable) for (1) the previous Environment, (2) the electronic copy of Installation Media, and (3) the physical Installation Media, and the role of each in serving as a source.

#### **INTERROGATORY NO. 21:**

For each Environment that ever existed on any Identified Rimini Computer System (excluding Environments listed on Exhibit A or contained within a virtual machine listed on Exhibit A), including but not limited to the Environments listed on Exhibit B or contained within a virtual machine listed on Exhibit B, Identify the Environment and the Source(s) from which You obtained all Installation Media used to create or modify that Environment. For example, if an Environment was created by cloning (copying) a previously existing Environment, which in turn was created from Installation Media stored on an Identified Rimini Computer System, which in turn were copied from physical Installation Media obtained directly from a specific client, the response should Identify the origins, names, locations at time of use, customer(s) from which or

on whose behalf you claim to have obtained the materials (if applicable), and website(s) or media 1 from which you obtained the materials (if applicable) for (1) the previous Environment, (2) the 2 electronic copy of Installation Media, and (3) the physical Installation Media, and the role of 3 each in serving as a source. 4 5 **INTERROGATORY NO. 22:** 6 For each Environment Identified in Your Responses to Interrogatories No. 20 and 21, 7 Identify the Source(s) from which You obtained all fixes, patches, updates, and other Software 8 and Support Materials (other than Installation Media) used to create or modify that Environment. 9 For example, if an Environment was modified by applying bundles from Oracle, TomorrowNow 10 and Rimini Street, the response should Identify the name, the sources and the locations of each of 11 those bundles, customer(s) from which or on whose behalf you claim to have obtained the 12 materials (if applicable), and website(s) or media from which you obtained the materials (if 13 14 applicable). 15 16 **INTERROGATORY NO. 23:** 17 For every Environment Identified in your Responses to Interrogatories No. 20 and 21, 18 describe each instance in which the Environment (including any Software and Support Materials 19 contained therein) was copied or used for a customer other than the specific customer, if any, 20 from which or on whose behalf You claim to have obtained the Environment. If You do not claim to have obtained a particular Environment from or on behalf of a specific customer, 21 describe each instance in which that copy of that Environment (or of any Software and Support 22 23 Materials contained therein) was copied or used. 24 25 **INTERROGATORY NO. 24:** 26 Identify every copy of any Software and Support Material that is or has at any time 27 been stored at each Non-Customer Location, and the Non-Customer location where it was stored. If any Non-Customer Locations have existed for which You cannot identify any particular 28

1	Software and Support Material stored at that	t location, Identify each such Non-Customer	
2	2 Location.		
3	3		
4	INTERROGATORY NO. 25:		
5	For every copy of Software and	Support Materials identified in your Response to	
6	Interrogatory No. 24, describe each instance in which the copy of Software and Support		
7	Materials was copied or used for a customer other than the specific customer, if any, from which		
8	or on whose behalf You claim to have obtained the Software and Support Materials that was		
9	copied or used. If You do not claim to have	copied or used. If You do not claim to have obtained a copy of Software and Support Materials	
10	indentified in your Response to Interrogator	ry No. 24 from or on behalf of a specific customer,	
11	describe each instance in which that copy o	f Software and Support Materials was copied or used	
12	2		
13	B DATED: May 25, 2011	Bingham McCutchen LLP	
14	4		
15			
16	5	By: Thomas S. Hixson	
17	7	Attorneys for Plaintiffs Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc., and	
18	3	Oracle International Corporation	
19	)		
20	)		
21	l		
22	2		
23	3		
24	1		
25	5		
26	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
27	7		
28	3		

1	PROOF OF SERVICE
2	I am a citizen of the United States, over 18 years of age, not a party to this
3	action and employed in the County of San Francisco, California at Three Embarcadero Center,
4	San Francisco, California 94111-4067.
5	Today I served the foregoing:
6	PLAINTIFFS ORACLE USA, INC., ORACLE AMERICA, INC.,
7	AND ORACLE INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION'S FIFTH SET OF INTERROGATORIES TO DEFENDANT RIMINI
8	STREET, INC.
9	by causing a true and correct copy of the above to be hand delivered in a sealed envelope with all
10	fees fully paid, addressed as follows:
11	Eric Buresh, Esq.
12	Shook, Hardy & Bacon L.L.P. 2555 Grand Blvd.
13	Kansas City, Missouri 64108
14	I declare that I effected the service at the direction of a member of the bar of this
15	court and that this declaration was executed on May 25, 2011.
16	11 6
17	My J
18	Shariya kam
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	

## **EXHIBIT 4**

### Case 2:10-cv-00106-LRH-VCF Document 315-1 Filed 05/31/12 Page 18 of 56

1	SHOOK, HARDY & BACON LLP	LEWIS AND ROCA LLP
2	B. Trent Webb, Esq. (pro hac vice)	W. West Allen (Nevada Bar No. 5566) 3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600
	Eric Buresh, Esq. (pro hac vice) 2555 Grand Boulevard	Las Vegas, Nevada 89169
3	Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613	Tel: (702) 949-8200 Fax: (702) 949-8398
4	Telephone: (816) 474-6550	WAllen@LRLaw.com
5	Facsimile: (816) 421-5547 bwebb@shb.com	CREENDED C TRALIDIC
	eburesh@shb.com	GREENBERG TRAURIG Mark G. Tratos, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 1086)
6		Brandon Roos, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 7888)
7	Robert H. Reckers, Esq. (pro hac vice) 600 Travis Street, Suite 1600	Leslie Godfrey, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 10229)
8	Houston, Texas 77002	3773 Howard Hughes Parkway Suite 400 North
	Telephone: (713) 227-8008	Las Vegas, NV 89169
9	Facsimile: (731) 227-9508	Telephone: (702) 792-3773
10	rreckers@shb.com	Facsimile: (702) 792-9002 tratosm@gtlaw.com
1.1		roosb@gtlaw.com
11		godfreyl@gtlaw.com
12		
13		Attorneys for Defendants
14		RIMINI STREET, INC. and SETH RAVIN
15	UNITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
16	DISTRICT (	OF NEVADA
17	ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation;	
	ORACLE AMERICA, INC., a Delaware	
18	corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATIONAL	
19	CORPORATION, a California corporation,	Case No. 2:10-cv-0106-LRH-PAL
20	Plaintiffs,	Case No. 2.10-ev-0100-LKII-I AL
21	v.	DEFENDANT RIMINI STREET INC.'S
21		SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS'
22	RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation;	INTERROGATORIES NOS. 24 AND 25
23	SETH RAVIN, an individual,	
24	Defendants.	
25		
26	Pursuant to Rules 26 and 33 of the Federal	eral Rules of Civil Procedure, Rimini Street, Inc.
27	("Rimini Street") provides the following response	es to Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America, Inc., and
28	Oracle International Corp.'s ("Oracle" or "Plaintif	f") Fifth Set of Interrogatories.

RIMINI'S SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL RESPONSES TO ORACLE'S INTERROGATORIES NOS. 24 AND 25

342490 v1

#### GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Rimini Street incorporates its prior General and Specific Objections, stated in Rimini Street's Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' First Set of Interrogatories, which were served on June 1, 2010, and in Rimini Streets Objections and Responses to Plaintiffs' Fifth Set of Interrogatories, which were served on July 11, 2011.

#### RESPONSES AND SPECIFIC OBJECTIONS

#### **INTERROGATORY NO. 24:**

Identify every copy of any Software and Support Material that is or has at any time been stored at each Non-Customer Location, and the Non-Customer location where it was stored. If any Non-Customer Locations have existed for which you cannot identify any particular Software and Support Material stored at that location, Identify each such Non-Customer Location.

#### **ORIGINAL ANSWER (July 11, 2011):**

Rimini Street objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks information for "any" materials that "is or has at any time" stored in the various identified locations. Rimini Street objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is not within the possession, custody, or control of Rimini Street. Rimini Street objects to the term "Non-Customer Location," and Oracle's definition of this term, as vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome. Accordingly, and without conceding that Oracle's Specified Locations meet Oracle's definition of Non-Customer Locations, Rimini will provide an answer for the Oracle Specified Locations. Rimini Street further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it would require Rimini Street to create a compilation, abstract, or summary from documents that Rimini Street has produced or will produce to Plaintiffs.

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general and specific objections, Rimini Street responds as follows:

- 2 -

Rimini responds that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d), Rimini has produced and/or will produce documents from which the answer to this Interrogatory can be ascertained, including but not limited to the following:

Exhibit 3, which lists Bates-numbers for documents regarding the Oracle Specified Locations. More specifically, the documents identified by Exhibit 3 indicate the contents of the Oracle Specified Locations, as well as use of such information.

#### FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWER (September 8, 2011):

Rimini Street objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks information for "any" materials that "is or has at any time" stored in the various identified locations. Rimini Street objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is not within the possession, custody, or control of Rimini Street. Rimini Street objects to the term "Non-Customer Location," and Oracle's definition of this term, as vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome. Accordingly, and without conceding that Oracle's Specified Locations meet Oracle's definition of Non-Customer Locations, Rimini will provide an answer for the Oracle Specified Locations. Rimini will further provide an answer with respect to network and local computer locations that, at any time, were intended for use, or were regularly used as, repositories of Oracle Software and Support Materials that are not associated with a specific customer. Rimini Street further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it would require Rimini Street to create a compilation, abstract, or summary from documents that Rimini Street has produced or will produce to Plaintiffs.

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general and specific objections, Rimini Street further responds as follows:

Rimini identifies the following as locations that currently or at one time included Oracle Software and Support Materials:

\\rsi-clsvr01\client\_software\PeopleSoft;

 $\rdotsince lsvr01\needingsin software;$ 

\\rsi-data01\share\software\oracle;

\\rsi-data01\share\software\PeopleSoft;

\\rsi-clsvr01\fileshare\software\Peoplesoft;

\\rsi-clsvr01\client software\For Development Use Only; and

\\rsi-clsvr03\d01\install.

The location \\rsi-clsvr01\client\_software\\PeopleSoft has included materials relating to PeopleSoft software. In the past, certain materials at this location may have been used in building environments for a particular client after Rimini verified that the particular client was entitled to these certain materials.

The location \\rsi-clsvr01\internal\_software was a parent directory with subdirectories that have included installation materials relating to PeopleSoft software and Oracle Database software. In the past, certain materials at this location may have been used in building environments for a particular client after Rimini verified that the particular client was entitled to these certain materials.

The location \\rsi-clsvr03\\d01\\install has included Software and Support Materials. In the past, certain materials at this location may have been used in building environments for a particular client after Rimini verified that the particular client was entitled to these certain materials.

The location \\rsi-data01\share\client\_archives\\_ftp.peoplesoft.com has included materials obtained from PeopleSoft's FTP website. This location was, at one time, intended to be used as a repository for materials for clients that had the right to access such materials through PeopleSoft's FTP site.

The location \\rsi-data01\\share\\software\\oracle has included materials relating to Oracle Database software.

The location \\rsi-data01\\share\\software\\PeopleSoft has included materials relating to PeopleSoft software.

The location \\rsi-clsvr01\client\_software\For Development Use Only has included materials relating to Oracle Software and Support Materials. Oracle has had access to this location via VPN for some time.

The address \\rsi-clsvr01\fileshare\software\Peoplesoft provides a link to \\rsi-clsvr01\client\_software\PeopleSoft, which may include Software and Support materials and described above. Additionally, the address 10.12.1.5 is the IP Address for \\rsi-clsvr01, which may include Software and Support materials as described above. Rimini further responds that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d), Rimini has produced and/or will produce documents from which the answer to this Interrogatory can be ascertained, including but not limited to the following:

Exhibit 3-1, which lists Bates-numbers for documents regarding the Oracle Specified Locations. More specifically, the documents identified by Exhibit 3-1 indicate the contents of the Oracle Specified Locations, as well as use of such information.

The documents spanning Bates-range RSI02971994-2158, which are Build Requests that may indicate the sources for environment builds.

#### **SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWER (November 22, 2011):**

Rimini Street objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome to the extent it seeks information for "any" materials that "is or has at any time" stored in the various identified locations. Rimini Street objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is not within the possession, custody, or control of Rimini Street. Rimini Street objects to the term "Non-Customer Location," and Oracle's definition of this term, as vague, ambiguous, overbroad and unduly burdensome. Accordingly, and without conceding that Oracle's Specified Locations meet Oracle's definition of Non-Customer Locations, Rimini will provide an answer for the Oracle Specified Locations. Rimini will further provide an answer with respect to network and local computer locations that, at any time, were intended for use, or were regularly used as, repositories of Oracle Software and Support Materials that are not associated with a specific customer. Rimini Street further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it would require Rimini Street to create a compilation, abstract, or summary from documents that Rimini Street has produced or will produce to Plaintiffs.

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general and specific objections, Rimini Street further responds as follows:

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14 15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

Software and Support Materials:

Rimini identifies the following as locations that currently or at one time included Oracle

\\rsi-clsvr01\client software\PeopleSoft;

\\rsi-clsvr01\internal software;

\\rsi-data01\share\client archives\ ftp.peoplesoft.com;

\\rsi-data01\share\software\oracle;

\\rsi-data01\share\software\PeopleSoft;

\\rsi-clsvr01\fileshare\software\Peoplesoft;

\\rsi-clsvr01\client software\For Development Use Only; and

\\rsi-clsvr03\d01\install.

The location \rsi-clsvr01\client software\PeopleSoft has included materials relating to PeopleSoft software. In the past, certain materials at this location may have been used in building environments for a particular client after Rimini verified that the particular client was entitled to these certain materials.

The location \rsi-clsvr01\internal software was a parent directory with subdirectories that have included installation materials relating to PeopleSoft software and Oracle Database software. In the past, certain materials at this location may have been used in building environments for a particular client after Rimini verified that the particular client was entitled to these certain materials.

The location \rsi-clsvr03\d01\install has included Software and Support Materials. In the past, certain materials at this location may have been used in building environments for a particular client after Rimini verified that the particular client was entitled to these certain materials.

The location \\rsi-data01\share\client archives\ ftp.peoplesoft.com has included materials obtained from PeopleSoft's FTP website. This location was, at one time, intended to be used as a repository for materials for clients that had the right to access such materials through PeopleSoft's FTP site.

The location \\rsi-data01\share\software\oracle has included materials relating to Oracle Database software.

The location \\rsi-data01\\share\\software\\PeopleSoft has included materials relating to PeopleSoft software.

The location \\rsi-clsvr01\client\_software\\For Development Use Only has included materials relating to Oracle Software and Support Materials. Oracle has had access to this location via VPN for some time.

The address \\rsi-clsvr01\fileshare\software\Peoplesoft provides a link to \\rsi-clsvr01\client\_software\PeopleSoft, which may include Software and Support materials and described above. Additionally, the address 10.12.1.5 is the IP Address for \\rsi-clsvr01, which may include Software and Support materials as described above.

The testimony from the October 5, 2011 deposition of Krista Williams at 24:24-26:14, 27:7-28:2, 28:14-30:6, 32:1-33:19, 36:5-39:21, 45:19-46:5, 54:3-54:25, 56:18-57:18, 58:13-59:18, 60:9-62:5, 63:4-63:17, and 190:1-190:21.

Rimini further responds that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d), Rimini has produced and/or will produce documents from which the answer to this Interrogatory can be ascertained, including but not limited to the following:

Exhibit 3-1, which lists Bates-numbers for documents regarding the Oracle Specified Locations. More specifically, the documents identified by Exhibit 3-1 indicate the contents of the Oracle Specified Locations, as well as use of such information.

The documents spanning Bates-range RSI02971994-2158, which are Build Requests that may indicate the sources for environment builds.

#### **INTERROGATORY NO. 25:**

For every copy of Software and Support Materials identified in your Response to Interrogatory No. 24, describe each instance in which the copy of Software and Support Materials was copied or used for a customer other than the specific customer, if any, from which or on whose behalf You claim to have obtained the Software and Support Materials that was copied or used. If you do not claim to have obtained a copy of Software and Support Materials indentified in your

Response to Interrogatory No. 24 from or on behalf of a specific customer, describe each instance in which that copy of Software and Support Materials was copied or used.

3

4 5

6 7

8

9 10

11

12

14

13

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

26

27

28

#### **ORIGINAL ANSWER (July 11, 2011):**

Rimini Street objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Rimini Street objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is not within the possession, custody, or control of Rimini Street. Rimini Street objects to the phrases "Non-Customer Location," and "used for a customer other than the specific customer" on the grounds and to the extent they are vague and ambiguous. Rimini Street further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it would require Rimini Street to create a compilation, abstract, or summary from documents that Rimini Street has produced or will produce to Plaintiffs.

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general and specific objections, Rimini Street responds as follows:

Rimini further responds that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d), Rimini has produced and/or will produce documents from which the answer to this Interrogatory can be ascertained, including but not limited to the following:

Exhibit 3, which lists Bates-numbers for documents regarding the Oracle Specified Locations. More specifically, the documents identified by Exhibit 3 indicate the contents of the Oracle Specified Locations, as well as use of such information.

#### FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWER (September 8, 2011):

Rimini Street objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Rimini Street objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is not within the possession, custody, or control of Rimini Street. Rimini Street objects to the phrases "Non-Customer Location," and "used for a customer other than the specific customer" on the grounds and to the extent they are vague and ambiguous. Rimini will further provide an answer with respect to network and local computer locations that, at any time, were intended for use, or were regularly used as, repositories of Oracle Software and Support Materials that are not associated with a specific customer. Rimini Street further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it would require Rimini Street to create

to Plaintiffs.

4

9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23 24

25

26 27

28

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general and specific objections, Rimini Street further responds as follows:

a compilation, abstract, or summary from documents that Rimini Street has produced or will produce

Rimini identifies the following as locations that currently or at one time included Oracle Software and Support Materials:

\\rsi-clsvr01\client software\PeopleSoft;

\\rsi-clsvr01\internal software;

\\rsi-data01\\share\client archives\ ftp.peoplesoft.com;

\\rsi-data01\share\software\oracle;

\\rsi-data01\share\software\PeopleSoft;

\\rsi-clsvr01\fileshare\software\Peoplesoft;

\\rsi-clsvr01\client software\For Development Use Only; and

\\rsi-clsvr03\d01\install.

The location \rsi-clsvr01\client software\PeopleSoft has included materials relating to PeopleSoft software. In the past, certain materials at this location may have been used in building environments for a particular client after Rimini verified that the particular client was entitled to these certain materials.

The location \\rsi-clsvr01\internal software was a parent directory with subdirectories that have included installation materials relating to PeopleSoft software and Oracle Database software. In the past, certain materials at this location may have been used in building environments for a particular client after Rimini verified that the particular client was entitled to these certain materials.

The location \\rsi-clsvr03\\d01\\install has included Software and Support Materials. In the past, certain materials at this location may have been used in building environments for a particular client after Rimini verified that the particular client was entitled to these certain materials.

The location \\rsi-data01\share\client archives\ ftp.peoplesoft.com has included materials obtained from PeopleSoft's FTP website. This location was, at one time, intended to be used as a

repository for materials for clients that had the right to access such materials through PeopleSoft's FTP site.

The location \rsi-data01\share\software\oracle has included materials relating to Oracle Database software.

The location \rsi-data01\share\software\PeopleSoft has included materials relating to PeopleSoft software.

The location \\rsi-clsvr01\client\_software\\For Development Use Only has included materials relating to Oracle Software and Support Materials. Oracle has had access to this location via VPN for some time.

The address \\rsi-clsvr01\fileshare\software\Peoplesoft provides a link to \\rsi-clsvr01\client\_software\PeopleSoft, which may include Software and Support materials and described above. Additionally, the address 10.12.1.5 is the IP Address for \\rsi-clsvr01, which may include Software and Support materials as described above.

Rimini further responds that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d), Rimini has produced and/or will produce documents from which the answer to this Interrogatory can be ascertained, including but not limited to the following:

Exhibit 3-1, which lists Bates-numbers for documents regarding the Oracle Specified Locations. More specifically, the documents identified by Exhibit 3-1 indicate the contents of the Oracle Specified Locations, as well as use of such information.

The documents spanning Bates-range RSI02971994-2158, which are Build Requests that may indicate the sources for environment builds.

#### SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL ANSWER (November 22, 2011):

Rimini Street objects to this Interrogatory as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Rimini Street objects to this interrogatory to the extent it seeks information that is not within the possession, custody, or control of Rimini Street. Rimini Street objects to the phrases "Non-Customer Location," and "used for a customer other than the specific customer" on the grounds and to the extent they are vague and ambiguous. Rimini will further provide an answer with respect to network and local

computer locations that, at any time, were intended for use, or were regularly used as, repositories of Oracle Software and Support Materials that are not associated with a specific customer. Rimini Street further objects to this interrogatory on the grounds that it would require Rimini Street to create a compilation, abstract, or summary from documents that Rimini Street has produced or will produce to Plaintiffs.

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general and specific objections, Rimini Street further responds as follows:

Rimini identifies the following as locations that currently or at one time included Oracle Software and Support Materials:

\\rsi-clsvr01\client software\PeopleSoft;

\\rsi-clsvr01\internal software;

\\rsi-data01\\share\client archives\ ftp.peoplesoft.com;

\\rsi-data01\share\software\oracle;

\\rsi-data01\share\software\PeopleSoft;

\\rsi-clsvr01\fileshare\software\Peoplesoft;

\\rsi-clsvr01\client software\For Development Use Only; and

\\rsi-clsvr03\d01\install.

The location \rsi-clsvr01\client software\PeopleSoft has included materials relating to PeopleSoft software. In the past, certain materials at this location may have been used in building environments for a particular client after Rimini verified that the particular client was entitled to these certain materials.

The location \rsi-clsvr01\internal software was a parent directory with subdirectories that have included installation materials relating to PeopleSoft software and Oracle Database software. In the past, certain materials at this location may have been used in building environments for a particular client after Rimini verified that the particular client was entitled to these certain materials.

27 28

The location \rsi-clsvr03\d01\install has included Software and Support Materials. In the past, certain materials at this location may have been used in building environments for a particular client after Rimini verified that the particular client was entitled to these certain materials.

The location \\rsi-data01\\share\client\_archives\\_ftp.peoplesoft.com has included materials obtained from PeopleSoft's FTP website. This location was, at one time, intended to be used as a repository for materials for clients that had the right to access such materials through PeopleSoft's FTP site.

The location \rsi-data01\share\software\oracle has included materials relating to Oracle Database software.

The location \rsi-data01\share\software\PeopleSoft has included materials relating to PeopleSoft software.

The location \\rsi-clsvr01\client\_software\For Development Use Only has included materials relating to Oracle Software and Support Materials. Oracle has had access to this location via VPN for some time.

The address \\rsi-clsvr01\fileshare\software\Peoplesoft provides a link to \\rsi-clsvr01\client\_software\PeopleSoft, which may include Software and Support materials and described above. Additionally, the address 10.12.1.5 is the IP Address for \\rsi-clsvr01, which may include Software and Support materials as described above.

The testimony from the October 5, 2011 deposition of Krista Williams at 24:24-26:14, 27:7-28:2, 28:14-30:6, 32:1-33:19, 36:5-39:21, 45:19-46:5, 54:3-54:25, 56:18-57:18, 58:13-59:18, 60:9-62:5, 63:4-63:17, and 190:1-190:21.

Rimini further responds that, pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 33(d), Rimini has produced and/or will produce documents from which the answer to this Interrogatory can be ascertained, including but not limited to the following:

Exhibit 3-1, which lists Bates-numbers for documents regarding the Oracle Specified Locations. More specifically, the documents identified by Exhibit 3-1 indicate the contents of the Oracle Specified Locations, as well as use of such information.

#### Case 2:10-cv-00106-LRH-VCF Document 315-1 Filed 05/31/12 Page 30 of 56

The documents spanning Bates-range RSI02971994-2158, which are Build Requests that 1 2 may indicate the sources for environment builds. 3 4 5 Dated: November 22, 2011 6 /s/ Robert H. Reckers SHOOK, HARDY & BACON LLP 7 B. Trent Webb, Esq. Eric Buresh, Esq. 8 2555 Grand Boulevard Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613 9 Telephone: (816) 474-6550 10 Facsimile: (816) 421-5547 bwebb@shb.com 11 eburesh@shb.com 12 Robert H. Reckers, Esq. 13 600 Travis Street, Suite 1600 Houston, Texas 77002 14 Telephone: (713) 227-8008 Facsimile: (731) 227-9508 15 rreckers@shb.com 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

Case 2:10-cv-00106-LRH-VCF Document 315-1 Filed 05/31/12 Page 31 of 56

# EXHIBIT 5 FILED UNDER SEAL

# EXHIBIT 6 FILED UNDER SEAL

## **EXHIBIT 7**

1	SHOOK, HARDY & BACON LLP	GREENBERG TRAURIG
2	B. Trent Webb, Esq. (pro hac vice) Eric Buresh, Esq. (pro hac vice)	Mark G. Tratos, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 1086) Brandon Roos, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 7888)
3	2555 Grand Boulevard	Leslie Godfrey, Esq. (Nevada Bar No. 10229)
	Kansas City, Missouri 64108-2613	3773 Howard Hughes Parkway
4	Telephone: (816) 474-6550 Facsimile: (816) 421-5547	Suite 400 North Las Vegas, NV 89169
5	bwebb@shb.com	Telephone: (702) 792-3773
6	eburesh@shb.com	Facsimile: (702) 792-9002
7	Robert H. Reckers, Esq. (pro hac vice)	tratosm@gtlaw.com roosb@gtlaw.com
	600 Travis Street, Suite 1600	godfreyl@gtlaw.com
8	Houston, Texas 77002 Telephone: (713) 227-8008	LEWIS AND ROCA LLP
9	Facsimile: (731) 227-9508	W. West Allen (Nevada Bar No. 5566)
10	rreckers@shb.com	3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600
		Las Vegas, Nevada 89169 Tel: (702) 949-8200
11		Fax: (702) 949-8398
12		WAllen@LRLaw.com
13		Attorneys for Defendants
14		RIMINI STREET, INC. and SETH RAVIN
15		
	LINITED STATES	DISTRICT COURT
16		DISTRICT COURT OF NEVADA
17	ORACLE USA, INC., a Colorado corporation;	I
18	ORACLE OSA, INC., a Colorado corporation,	
19	corporation; and ORACLE INTERNATIONAL	G N 2 10 010( I DII DAI
	CORPORATION, a California corporation,	Case No. 2:10-cv-0106-LRH-PAL
20	Plaintiffs,	DEFENDANT RIMINI STREET INC.'S
21	v.	SECOND AMENDED RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS'
22		THIRD SET OF REQUESTS FOR
23	RIMINI STREET, INC., a Nevada corporation; SETH RAVIN, an individual,	ADMISSIONS TO DEFENDANT
		RIMINI STREET, INC.
24	Defendants.	
25	Pursuant to Federal Rules of Civil Prod	cedure 26 and 36, Rimini Street, Inc. ("Rimini
26	Street"), by and through its undersigned counsel	, responds to Oracle USA, Inc., Oracle America,
27	Inc., and Oracle International Corp.'s ("Ora	cle") Third Set of Requests for Admissions
28	("Requests").	
I	1.252120 1 DEEENDANTIC CECOND AMENDED DECROS	ICEC AND ODIECTIONS TO DI AINTIEES' THIRD DE A

DEFENDANT'S SECOND AMENDED RESPONSES AND OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFFS' THIRD RFAs

352130 v1

#### **GENERAL OBJECTIONS**

The following General Objections shall be deemed incorporated into the objections and Responses to each and every specific Request for Admission. To the extent that specific General Objections are cited in a specific Response, those specific objections are provided because they are believed to be particularly applicable to the specific Request. If Rimini Street specifically refers to General Objections in a Response, Rimini Street does not intend to waive any other General Objection applicable to information falling within the scope of the Request.

- 1. Rimini Street objects to Plaintiff's Requests to the extent that Plaintiff seeks to require Rimini Street to provide any information beyond what is available to Rimini Street at present from a reasonable search of its own files and a reasonable inquiry of its present employees likely to have the information necessary to admit or deny these requests.
- 2. Rimini Street objects to Plaintiff's Requests to the extent that Plaintiff seeks to impose on Rimini Street any other obligation not imposed by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or the Local Rules for the District of Nevada.
- 3. Rimini Street objects to the disclosure of information protected by the attorney-client privilege and/or work-product immunity.
- 4. Rimini Street objects to Plaintiff's Requests to the extent they call upon Rimini Street to admit or deny information that is irrelevant to the subject matter of this action. Rimini Street does not concede that any Request to which it responds is relevant to the subject matter of this litigation.
- 5. Rimini Street objects to these Requests to the extent they contravene the purposes underlying Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 36 to narrow the issues in this case and facilitate proof with respect to issues that can be eliminated. By way of example and without limitation, Rimini Street objects to these Requests to the extent they seek admissions related to highly contested issues, rather than admissions related to non-contested issues that could narrow the issues in this case. Rimini Street also objects to these Requests to the extent they seek admissions related to unidentified materials, which would not facilitate proof relating to issues that can be eliminated from this case.

- 6. Rimini Street objects to these Requests to the extent they contain vague, ambiguous, and non-specific statements.
- 7. Rimini Street objects to these Requests to the extent they cannot be admitted or denied without providing commentary.
- 8. Rimini Street objects to the definition of the phrase "more than a de minimis or trivial amount of protectable expression" to the extent it seeks to incorporate legal conclusions.
- 9. Rimini Street objects to the definitions of the terms "Complete or Partial Copy", "Environment," "Oracle Database Software," "Oracle Enterprise Software," and "Software and Support Materials" to the extent that, when read together, the definitions are convoluted and circular.
- 10. Rimini objects to the definition of the terms "Internal Software Library" and "Software Library" to the extent that the proffered definitions deviates from the plain and ordinary meaning of the term "library" and to the extent that these terms imply a library of software for general or generic use without regard to rights afforded to Rimini customers' under their respective license agreements with Oracle. Rimini further objects to the inclusion of the phase "related materials" in the proffered definition of "Software Library" as vague and ambiguous.
- as vague and ambiguous and to the extent that Oracle's requests seek to imply that the tools used by Rimini were prohibited by the terms of Oracle's various website. As conventional Internet browsers submit Internet download requests in what may be considered a "rapid, automated fashion," it is unclear what Internet communication software is excluded from Oracle's definition. To respond, Rimini construes Oracle's proffered definition of "Automated Download Tools" to encompass tools that utilized standard Internet browsers and applications to interact with websites, including such Rimini-created tools listed by Oracle's definition.
- 12. Rimini objects to Oracle's Exhibit A and Oracle's requests citing this exhibit as overly broad and unduly burdensome. Rimini does not have reasonable means by which it can verify the accuracy of the 88,730 files listed on the of the 1,699 pages of text found in Exhibit A, and Oracle has declined to provide a declaration detailing how Exhibit A was created. Where

possible, Rimini has attempted to respond based on Oracle's representation that the files listed on Exhibit A correspond to files produced from Rimini's HRMS Delivered Objects folder. However, for many requests directed to Exhibit A, Rimini cannot respond given the extreme burden and overbreadth associated with Oracle's Exhibit A.

#### **RESPONSES**

#### **REQUEST NO. 25:**

Admit that each Environment identified in Your responses to Interrogatories No. 20 and 21 as containing Siebel-branded Oracle Enterprise Software embodied more than a *de minimis* or trivial amount of protectable expression from at least one of the Registered Works.

#### **RESPONSE:**

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general objections, Rimini admits that each Environment identified in its response to Interrogatories No. 20 and 21 as containing Siebel-branded Oracle Enterprise Software embodied more than a trivial amount of protectable expression from at least one of the Registered Works.

#### **REQUEST NO. 26:**

With respect to Your written and electronic requests that Oracle ship software to a Rimini Street address, admit that more than 50% of the requests asked Oracle to ship the software to an "offsite backup location."

#### **RESPONSE:**

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general objections, Rimini responds: Admitted.

#### **REQUEST NO. 27:**

Admit that, at least once, You instructed a Rimini Street customer or prospective Rimini Street customer to state that software was to be shipped to an "offsite backup location" when that customer or prospective customer requested that Oracle ship software to a Rimini Street address.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Rimini notes that Exhibit A includes duplicate entries for numerous files. In responding, Rimini considers these duplicate entries to correspond to only one actual file in the HRMS Delivered Objects folder.

1 a R 3 c 4 T a 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

acts of copying Oracle Software and Support Material into the indicated file locations in 2007. Rimini objects to this request to the extent it relates to information not in Rimini's custody or control. Rimini did not maintain records regarding each such action contemplated by this request. Therefore, Rimini cannot admit or deny this request given its overbreadth and the lack of available information.

#### **REQUEST NO. 63:**

Admit that, in 2010, Rimini Street only copied Oracle Software and Support Material into the Internal Software Libraries when no copy of that material was already present in the Internal Software Libraries.

#### **RESPONSE:**

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general objections, Rimini denies copying Oracle software or support materials into the network locations indicated by this request in 2010.

#### **REQUEST NO. 64:**

Admit that, in 2011, Rimini Street only copied Oracle Software and Support Material into the Internal Software Libraries when no copy of that material was already present in the Internal Software Libraries.

#### **RESPONSE:**

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general objections, Rimini denies copying Oracle software or support materials into the network locations indicated by this request in 2011.

#### **REQUEST NO. 65:**

Admit that, in 2006, Rimini Street built the majority of local Environments created by Rimini Street using Oracle Software and Support Material that was present in the Internal Software Libraries.

#### **RESPONSE:**

Rimini objects to the phrase "created by Rimini Street using Oracle Software and Support Material that was present in the Internal Software Libraries" as vague and ambiguous. In responding, Rimini interprets this phrase to mean "created by Rimini Street using the copies of Oracle Software and Support Material stored in the Internal Software Libraries."

### **REQUEST NO. 66:**

2 3

4

Admit that, in 2007, Rimini Street built the majority of local Environments created by Rimini Street using Oracle Software and Support Material that was present in the Internal Software Libraries.

5 6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

**RESPONSE:** 

Rimini objects to the phrase "created by Rimini Street using Oracle Software and Support Material that was present in the Internal Software Libraries" as vague and ambiguous. responding, Rimini interprets this phrase to mean "created by Rimini Street using the copies of Oracle Software and Support Material stored in the Internal Software Libraries."

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general and specific objections: Denied.

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general and specific objections: Denied.

#### **REQUEST NO. 67:**

Admit that, in 2008, Rimini Street built the majority of local Environments created by Rimini Street using Oracle Software and Support Material that was present in the Internal Software Libraries.

#### **RESPONSE:**

Rimini objects to the phrase "created by Rimini Street using Oracle Software and Support Material that was present in the Internal Software Libraries" as vague and ambiguous. responding, Rimini interprets this phrase to mean "created by Rimini Street using the copies of Oracle Software and Support Material stored in the Internal Software Libraries."

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general and specific objections: Denied.

#### **REQUEST NO. 68:**

Admit that, in 2009, Rimini Street built the majority of local Environments created by Rimini Street using Oracle Software and Support Material that was present in the Internal Software Libraries.

#### **RESPONSE:**

Rimini objects to the phrase "created by Rimini Street using Oracle Software and Support Material that was present in the Internal Software Libraries" as vague and ambiguous.

3

4

5

67

8

10

1112

13

14

15

16

17

1819

20

21

22

23

24

2526

27

28

responding, Rimini interprets this phrase to mean "created by Rimini Street using the copies of Oracle Software and Support Material stored in the Internal Software Libraries."

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general and specific objections: Denied.

#### **REQUEST NO. 69:**

Admit that, in 2010, Rimini Street built the majority of local Environments created by Rimini Street using Oracle Software and Support Material that was present in the Internal Software Libraries.

#### **RESPONSE:**

Rimini objects to the phrase "created by Rimini Street using Oracle Software and Support Material that was present in the Internal Software Libraries" as vague and ambiguous. In responding, Rimini interprets this phrase to mean "created by Rimini Street using the copies of Oracle Software and Support Material stored in the Internal Software Libraries."

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general and specific objections: Denied.

#### **REQUEST NO. 70:**

Admit that, in 2011, Rimini Street built the majority of local Environments created by Rimini Street using Oracle Software and Support Material that was present in the Internal Software Libraries.

#### **RESPONSE:**

Rimini objects to the phrase "created by Rimini Street using Oracle Software and Support Material that was present in the Internal Software Libraries" as vague and ambiguous. In responding, Rimini interprets this phrase to mean "created by Rimini Street using the copies of Oracle Software and Support Material stored in the Internal Software Libraries."

Subject to and without waiver of the foregoing general and specific objections: Denied.

#### **REQUEST NO. 71:**

Admit that, in 2006, at least 90% of the Oracle Software and Support Material in the Internal Software Libraries that was used to build local Environments created by Rimini Street was not organized or segregated by client.

#### **RESPONSE:**

1 **REQUEST NO. 249:** 2 Admit that, in 2011, Rimini Street used one or more of the environments identified as 3 items 1-32 on Exhibit C to create the majority of DAT files generated by Rimini Street. **RESPONSE:** 4 Subject to and without waiver of its general objections: Admitted. 5 **REQUEST NO. 250:** 6 7 Admit that, in 2011, Rimini Street used one or more of the environments identified as 8 items 1-32 on Exhibit C to create the majority of DAT files received from Rimini Street by each of Rimini Street's then-current customers. 9 10 **RESPONSE:** 11 Subject to and without waiver of its general objections: Admitted. 12 13 DATED: January 4, 2012 14 SHOOK, HARDY & BACON 15 By: /s/ Robert H. Reckers 16 Robert H. Reckers, Esq. Attorney for Defendants 17 Rimini Street, Inc. and Seth Ravin 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

1 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE** 2 I hereby certify that the foregoing Defendant's First Amended Responses and Objections 3 to Plaintiffs' Third Set of Requests for Admissions was served on the 4th day of January, 2012, via email, as indicated below. 4 5 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN LLP 6 RICHARD J. POCKER (NV Bar No. 3568) GEOFFREY M. HOWARD (pro hac vice) 300 South Fourth Street, Suite 800 THOMAS S. HIXSON (pro hac vice) 7 Las Vegas, NV 89101 KRISTEN A. PALUMBO (pro hac vice) Telephone: (702) 382-7300 Three Embarcadero Center 8 Facsimile: (702) 382-2755 San Francisco, CA 94111-4067 9 rpocker@bsfllp.com Telephone: 415.393.2000 Facsimile: 415.393.2286 10 BOIES, SCHILLER & FLEXNER LLP geoff.howard@bingham.com STEVEN C. HOLTZMAN (pro hac vice) thomas.hixson@bingham.com 11 FRED NORTON (pro hac vice) kristen.palumbo@bingham.com KIERAN P. RINGGENBERG (pro hac vice) 12 1999 Harrison Street, Suite 900 13 Oakland, CA 94612 ORACLE CORPORATION Telephone: (510) 874-1000 JAMES C. MAROULIS (pro hac vice) 14 Facsimile: (510) 874-1460 500 Oracle Parkway sholtzman@bsfllp.com M/S 5op7 15 fnorton@bsfllp.com Redwood City, CA 94070 kringgenberg@bsfllp.com Telephone: 650.506.4846 16 Facsimile: 650.506.7114 17 iim.maroulis@oracle.com 18 19 By: /s/ Ryan Dykal\_\_\_ 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

## EXHIBIT 8 FILED UNDER SEAL

# EXHIBIT 9 FILED UNDER SEAL

### EXHIBIT 10 FILED UNDER SEAL

### EXHIBIT 11 FILED UNDER SEAL

### EXHIBIT 12 FILED UNDER SEAL

### EXHIBIT 13 FILED UNDER SEAL

### EXHIBIT 14 FILED UNDER SEAL

### EXHIBIT 15 FILED UNDER SEAL

### EXHIBIT 16 FILED UNDER SEAL

## EXHIBIT 17 FILED UNDER SEAL

### EXHIBIT 18 FILED UNDER SEAL

## EXHIBIT 19 FILED UNDER SEAL

### EXHIBIT 20 FILED UNDER SEAL